1 2	Elizabeth L. Deeley (Bar No. 230798)  elizabeth.deeley@lw.com  Melanie M. Blunsch (Bar No. 234264)			
3	melanie.blunschi@lw.com LATHAM & WATKINS LLP			
4	505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94111			
5	415.391.0600 / 415.395.8095 (Fax)			
6	Andrew B. Clubok (pro hac vice)  andrew.clubok@lw.com			
7	Susan E. Engel (pro hac vice) susan.engel@lw.com LATHAM & WATKINS LLP			
8	555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 1000 Washington, D.C. 20004			
9	202.637.2200 / 202.637.2201 (Fax)			
10	Counsel for Defendant Facebook, Inc.			
11	Additional Counsel on Signature Page			
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
14	OAKLAND DIVISION			
15	CHRISTINE HOLT, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No. 4	l:16-cv-02266-JST	
16	Plaintiff,		TION AND [ <del>PROPOSED]</del> ORDER CASE PENDING DECISION IN	
17	v.	<i>FACEBOOK, INC. V. DUGUID</i> , NO. 19-511 (S. CT.)		
18 19	FACEBOOK, INC.,			
20	Defendant.	Judge:	Hon. Jon S. Tigar	
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
ING			G	

## Case 4:16-cv-02266-JST Document 103 Filed 10/06/20 Page 2 of 4

Defendant Facebook, Inc., and Plaintiff Christine Holt jointly and respectfully request that
this case be stayed pending the Supreme Court's decision in Facebook, Inc. v. Duguid, No. 19-511
(S. Ct.), <a href="https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/19">https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/19</a>
<u>-511.html</u> . This case was previously stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's disposition of Facebook's
petition for interlocutory review under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) of this Court's decision granting in
part and denying in part Facebook's motion to dismiss. See ECF No. 86. That decision held that
Holt had plausibly alleged the existence of an automatic telephone dialing system (ATDS). See
ECF No. 72.

In a related case, *Duguid v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. 15-cv-00985-JST, 2017 WL 635117 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2017), this Court held that the plaintiff had not plausibly alleged an ATDS, a decision which the Ninth Circuit reversed, *see* 926 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2019). On October 17, 2019, Facebook petitioned the Supreme Court for review of the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Duguid*. This case remained stayed, and the parties believed it would be prudent to await a decision in *Duguid* before moving this Court to lift the stay. On July 9, 2020, the Supreme Court granted certiorari in *Duguid* to decide "[w]hether the definition of ATDS in the [Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA)] encompasses any device that can 'store' and 'automatically dial' telephone numbers, even if the device does not 'us[e] a random or sequential number generator." *See Duguid*, Question Presented, <a href="https://www.supremecourt.gov/qp/19-00511qp.pdf">https://www.supremecourt.gov/qp/19-00511qp.pdf</a>. Here, Holt alleges that Facebook violated the TCPA by using "an automatic telephone dialing system that has the capacity to store and dial telephone numbers, automatically and *en masse*." ECF No. 29 ¶ 3. The Supreme Court will thus decide the meaning of the ATDS provision at the crux of this case.

On September 24, 2020, this Court sua sponte lifted the stay and scheduled a case management conference for October 27, 2020. The parties have since conferred and now **STIPULATE** that:

1. The Supreme Court's resolution of *Duguid* is likely to materially affect the disposition of this case, and staying this matter pending resolution of *Duguid* will conserve judicial resources and avoid needless expense;

1	2. A stay is appropriate, will not prejudice either party, and will best serve the orderly				
2	course of justice; and,				
3	3. The parties will notify this Court of the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Duguid</i> within				
4	14 days and will include in that notice a proposal for next steps in this case.				
5	IT SO STIPULATED.				
6					
7	Dated: October 5, 2020	Respectfully submitted,			
8		/s/ Melanie M. Blunschi			
9	Andrew B. Clubok ( <i>pro hac vice</i> ) Susan E. Engel ( <i>pro hac vice</i> ) LATHAM & WATKINS LLP	Melanie M. Blunschi (Bar No. 234264) Elizabeth L. Deeley (Bar No. 230798) LATHAM & WATKINS LLP			
10	555 Eleventh Street, NW Suite 1000	505 Montgomery Street Suite 2000			
11	Washington, D.C. 20004-1304	San Francisco, CA 94111-6538			
12	Telephone: (202) 637-2200 Fax: (202) 637-2201	Telephone: (415) 395-8233 Fax: (415) 395-8095			
13	Email: andrew.clubok@lw.com susan.engel@lw.com	Email: elizabeth.deeley@lw.com melanie.blunschi@lw.com			
14	Counsel for Defendant Facebook, Inc.				
15		/s/ Benjamin H. Richman			
16	J. Aaron Lawson (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) alawson@edelson.com	Benjamin H. Richman (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)			
17	EDELSON PC 123 Townsend Street, Suite 100	brichman@edelson.com EDELSON PC			
18	San Francisco, California 94107 Tel: 415.212.9300	350 North LaSalle Street, 14th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60654			
19	Fax: 415.373.9495	Tel: 312.589.6370 Fax: 312.589.6378			
20	Stefan Coleman (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) law@stefancoleman.com				
21	LAW OFFICES OF STEFAN COLEMAN, PLLC				
22	201 South Biscayne Boulevard, 28th Floor Miami, Florida 33131				
23	Tel: 877.333.9427 Fax: 888.498.8946				
24		ntiff Christine Holt			
25					
26					
27					
28					

[PROPOSED] ORDER Upon consideration of the parties' Stipulation to Stay Case Pending Decision in *Facebook*, Inc. v. Duguid, No. 19-511 (S. Ct.), the Court finds that good cause for the requested stay has been shown and **GRANTS** the parties' Stipulation. This case is **STAYED** pending the Supreme Court's decision in *Facebook, Inc. v. Duguid*. The parties shall notify the Court within 14 days of the Supreme Court's decision in Facebook, *Inc. v. Duguid* and will include in that notice a proposal for next steps in this case. IS SO ORDERED. DATED: October 6, 2020 ted States District Judge